

Appl No. 10/716,214
Amendment Dated January 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action of September 7, 2005

REMARKS:

The Office Action dated September 7, 2005 has been received and carefully reviewed. Reconsideration of the present invention is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks below.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies extended by the Examiner to applicant's agent in the telephone interview of January 12, 2006. During the interview independent amendments to the language of Claims 13, 19, and 23 were discussed to distinguish over the Archie, Jr. et al. patent 6,562,171 and the Gill patent 6,397,451. The Examiner tentatively agreed to allow Claims 13, 19, and 23 with the proposed language added.

This application was filed with a total of 27 claims, with Claims 1, 11, 12, 13, 19, and 23 in independent form. Claims 10, 18, and 22 have been previously withdrawn as directed to non-elected inventions. Claims 1-12 and 24-26 are canceled without prejudice in this amendment. Claims 13-17, 19-21, 23, and 27 are still pending in this application, with Claims 13, 19, and 23 in independent form. Claims 13, 19, 23, and 27 are amended in this response.

Claim 13 is an independent claim and, as amended, calls for a single pass process for forming yard signs and essentially comprising the steps of: conveying each two sided sheet to a printing station and screen printing an image on an image side of the sheet, the sheet being coated on both sides with a fusible polymer having a first thickness on the image side and a greater second thickness on an inner side; conveying the printed sheet to a scoring station and scoring the sheet for form a fold line; conveying the scored sheet

Appl No. 10/716,214
Amendment Dated January 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action of September 7, 2005

to a folding mechanism and folding the sheet at the fold line; and conveying the folded sheet to a sealing device and ultrasonically heating side edges to fuse the polymer on the inner side to form a pocket to receive a sign support member.

Claim 19 is an independent claim and, as amended, is similar to Claim 13 except that Claim 19 recites the processing steps without specifying the conveying of the sheet from station to station and, additionally, recites greater detail in the processing steps.

Claim 19 includes the requirement that the sheet processed is coated with a fusible polymer having a first thickness on the image side and a greater second thickness on an inner side of the sheet.

Claim 23 is an independent claim and, as amended, calls for a single pass system for forming yard signs and recites processing stations including a printing station, a scoring station, a folding mechanism, a sealing station, and a curing station. Claim 23 was amended to include the elements originally recited in Claims 24-26. Additionally, Claim 23 calls recites that the sheet to be processed by the system is coated on both sides with a fusible polymer having a first thickness on an image side and a greater second thickness on an opposite inner side.

Claims 13, 19, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious from Archie '171 in view of Gill '451. As amended, Claims 13 and 19 call for single pass processes and Claim 23 calls for a single pass system for forming yard signs from individual sheets of sign stock coated on both sides with a fusible polymer having a first thickness on an image side and a greater second thickness on an opposite inner side.

Appl No. 10/716,214
Amendment Dated January 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action of September 7, 2005

Claims 13, 19, and 23 are believed to distinguish over Archie and Gill which both show processes for making articles printed on both sides which use separate adhesives rather than a fused polymer coating, as called for in Claims 13, 19, and 23. Therefore, applicant urges that Claims 13, 19, and 23 should be allowable over the cited references.

Claims 14-17 depend from Claim 13; Claims 20 and 21 depend from Claim 19; and Claim 27 depends from Claim 23. Claims 14-17, 20, and 21 add process steps and 27 adds elements; and said claims are believed to distinguish over the cited references, including Query 5,937,333, for the same reasons as their respective parent claims.

Claims 13-17, 19-21, 23, and 27 are presented for reconsideration. Applicant contends that said claims define processes and systems for forming yard signs which are not anticipated by or obvious from any of the references of record, either singly or in combination. Therefore, the allowance of Claims 13-17, 19-21, 23, and 27 is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below in the event it is felt the prosecution of this application can be expedited thereby.

Appl No. 10/716,214
Amendment Dated January 20, 2006
Reply to Office Action of September 7, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey W. Harms



By Malcolm A. Litman, Reg. No. 19,579
Shughart, Thomson & Kilroy, P.C.
120 West 12th Street, Suite 1600
Kansas City, Missouri 64105
Tel: (816) 421-3355
Fax: (816) 374-0509